

22122878-10

REMARKS

This reply is filed in response to the office action dated February 3, 2006.

Reconsideration of the application and the claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected the term "with efficiency greater than 2% of catalytic reaction energy" in claim 49 because it is not supported in the specification. For purposes of expediting the allowance of this application, the Applicant has amended claim 49 to strike "with efficiency greater than 2% of catalytic reaction energy" from claim 49.

Double Patenting


With respect to the double patenting rejection over co-owned U.S. patents, applicants herewith submit thirteen terminal disclaimers to obviate the double patenting rejections remaining in the above-identified patent application.

All pending claims are believed to be patentable, reconsideration of the rejected claim is requested and a favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited. If a telephone interview would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is requested to telephone the number provided below.

Please charge any fee due associated with this reply to Deposit Account No. 02-0393.

Date: April 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



James David Jacobs
Registration No. 24,299
BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP
1114 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 626-4100 telephone
(212) 310-1600 facsimile